CHAPTER 6-SERVICE DISTRICTS

INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapters have provided background information on the physical character of the County and its demographics. This information helps to explain the foundation upon which the goals and policies in the first chapter were formulated. These goals are the result of a merger between public policy and enlightened owner self-interest; that is, the realization by County government and residents alike of the need to retain the natural beauty of the County for public and private good while accommodating growth. In understanding this need, the County recognizes that its purpose is ~~not to oppose change, but~~ to accommodate ~~provide for~~ orderly, efficient, and well-planned growth while preserving and protecting the natural environment and countryside. Early speculative development can have a devastating effect upon the realization of the full potential of the area. The County seeks optimum development patterns and an equitable distribution of costs and benefits, realizing in the process that the sum of subdivisions does not necessarily make a community. Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 translate the goals, policies, and background data into an action plan for the County.

LAND USE PLANS—GENERAL INFORMATION

In developing the following land use plans, and their supporting fiscal, transportation, and public facility/utility plans, it has been accepted as given that:

1. The County has a variety of physiographies each with attributes worth preserving, each with sensitivities to development, but each with areas suitable to some type of development; and that,

2. Areas suitable for development should be delineated and planned according to general County need, ability to provide services, and the character. of the area; and that,

3. Certain patterns of development may be a burden to the taxpayer and destructive to the environment and character of the County and, therefore, should be minimized.

For the purpose of developing land use plans, the County is divided into three categories: service districts (Chapter 6), villages and settlements (Chapter 7), and rural areas (Chapter 8). Areas designated as service districts are designed to accommodate the highest density residential, commercial, and industrial uses in the County. Service districts are either currently served with public utilities or planned for the future provision of some type of public utilities in the form of public sewer, water or both. Village designations~~, of which there are three,~~ have limited and smaller scaled mixtures of residential, commercial, and service land uses. Settlements are generally rural, residential clusters without any designated and associated commercial or service land use areas.

~~The majority~~ Over 90 percent of the County, characterized by agricultural uses, open space, wooded tracts, and mountains, is designated as rural area. It is divided for the purpose of zoning into the Rural Agricultural (RA) ~~area~~ and the Rural Conservation (RC) ~~area~~ districts. The RA land consists predominantly of open agricultural lands; the RC land contains predominantly the wooded mountain and steep slope areas. Both zoning district categories are intended for agricultural or agriculturally related uses. Zoning regulations establish standards that discourage and limit residential development to very low densities not intended to conflict with the agricultural and forestal uses or the environmentally sensitive areas of the County.

SERVICE DISTRICTS

Introduction

A long-standing and important Fauquier County planning goal~~, re-adopted for the 1992-2010 plan~~, since 1967 has been to concentrate and guide growth into the ~~and around~~ Service Districts. Service Districts are the ~~designated growth~~ areas planned for ~~the most intense development in terms of~~ relatively more intensive use and density. In order to support and promote growth, adequate public facilities and infrastructure, including public water and sewer, have been planned for the service districts.

However, portions of service districts may be designated to receive only one type of public utility where economic, physical or environmental considerations make the provision of all public services infeasible. Where this occurs, the portions of the service district which are not planned for public utilities are designated as “non-sewered” or “non-watered” growth areas. While still part of the overall service district, these areas may be planned for substantially less growth and densities than the rest of the service district, but more than that found in the agricultural areas of the County.

The accomplishment of many other important County policies and goals is facilitated through the service district concept, particularly protecting and promoting traditional agricultural uses, rural lifestyles, historic sites and areas, unique open spaces, and preserving the environment. By concentrating the majority of population growth and non-agricultural industrial and commercial uses in service districts, the County is able to promote other planning goals designed to protect the rural areas from unplanned and destructive growth and also provide public services in a more efficient and cost effective manner.

The County has six Service Districts and three Village Service Districts. The Service Districts include: Bealeton, Marshall, New Baltimore, Opal, Remington (includes the Town of Remington) and Warrenton (includes the Town of Warrenton). Portions of these districts are currently served with public sewer and water and have a range of existing or planned public facilities (e.g., fire and rescue, library, parks,

schools) associated with smaller town scaled development, with build-out populations generally ranging from 6,000 to 14,000 residents.

The Village Service Districts are Calverton, Catlett, and Midland. Public facilities and services are expected to be limited due to the planned village scale and build-out populations, resulting in a maximum population of approximately 1,200 within each community. Community growth in Calverton and Catlett is severely limited by the Occoquan Watershed Sewer Policy and state wastewater treatment, discharge and permitting requirements. Both villages have a significant number of existing businesses and homes with failing drainfields needing limited public sewer service, as outlined within their discrete plan sections. Midland is located in the Occoquan and Rappahannock Watersheds, and faces similar public wastewater treatment constraints.

Details regarding each district are included within this Chapter. (Note that the Service District concept was first introduced in the 1967 Comprehensive Plan.)

The County has nine designated Service Districts: Bealeton, Calverton, Catlett, Marshall, Midland, New Baltimore, Opal, Remington (which includes the Town of Remington) and Warrenton (which includes the Town of Warrenton). The incorporated town of The Plains functions as a Service District within its corporate boundaries. Portions of Warrenton, Bealeton, New Baltimore and Remington are currently served by public water and sewer, and Opal is served by public sewer while public water service is under development. Marshall is served by a public sewer and a private water system, which is in the process of being converted to a public system. Catlett is currently served by public water but not sewer. ~~Opal,~~ Midland, with the exception of limited public sewer serving the airport, and Calverton have no public sewer and water services.

~~In 1977, after five years of review, a second Comprehensive Plan was adopted. This included a re-analysis of the anticipated population and adopted a shorter planning period of 10 rather than 20 years. The revised plan showed major decreases in the anticipated growth and corresponding reductions in the holding capacity of the Service Districts. The factors responsible for these changes were stated to be, "the result of changes in the rates and patterns of urbanization, in transportation, in the economy, in legal precedent, and in other factors" (including the Occoquan Policy). By reducing the Service District size to correspond with the revised population figures, and by designating future expansion areas, the County took a time phased approached to the Districts' development. This approach became viable with the new 10 year planning period and 5 year review. The methodology for establishing these revised Service Districts is described in Chapter 6 of the 1977 Plan. Since the basic districts have remained the same for the 1987 Plan and for this update, the reader is referred to the 1977 Plan for the details of how the districts~~

~~were reconfigured~~.

Planning the Districts: ~~1992-2010~~ 1997-2020

In planning the Service Districts, and in making periodic adjustments to Service District boundaries, land uses, and densities therein, the County reviews and analyzes a range of factors. Of the factors considered, existing land use and zoning, and the wishes of residents concerning Service District growth, are of major importance. To foster public participation, the Board of Supervisors in the 1992 Plan update appointed a committee of three citizens from each magisterial district to serve on an advisory committee to the Planning Commission. The Plan Review Advisory Committee (PRAC) met with citizens in their districts, and the Planning Commission, on a frequent and continuing basis as the 1992-2010 plan was prepared. In addition, the Planning Commission held public meetings throughout the County to explain the planning process and to gather public information. Such meetings were held for all the Service Districts.

In 1997, the Board of Supervisors initiated the update of the Service District plans through an expanded and lengthy public process. An appointed Citizen Planning Committee for each district plan was established. Each committee held extensive public work sessions that extended over 18-months. The draft plans were submitted through the public hearing and adoption process for the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. The Marshall and Warrenton Service Districts were the last to be adopted.

The 1997-2004 Comprehensive Plan amendments altered district boundaries, allowing traditional neighborhood, village and town-scaled land use designs. These designs are more compatible with existing neighborhood densities, citizen views and expectations of their community at build-out, environmental constraints, as well as public facility infrastructure requirements and limitations in expanding public sewer and water services.

Service District Phasing

The 1992 Plan promoted time-phased development within the service districts (Phase I: 1992-2000; Phase II: 2000-2010; and Phase III: Post-2010) based on the extension of transportation, sewer and water infrastructure. The elemental phasing was envisioned to enable cost effective planning for public facilities, utilities, transportation infrastructure, and to better predict overall development and the availability of public facilities. Implementation of the Service District plans was primarily dependent upon the provision of public water and sewer facilities to accommodate the planned densities for commercial, industrial and residential densities. Providing planned schools, transportation, sewer and water infrastructure requires long range planning and capital investments to produce timely and cost effective services and facilities.

~~For this Plan, the planning period was decreased from 20 years to 18 years, or through 2010, to better plan for the projected population growth, to enable cost effective planning for public facilities, utilities, and transportation infrastructure, and to implement a time phased approach to Service District development. Consideration has been given to anticipated transportation, sewer, and water infrastructure needs. Implementation of the Service District plans in primarily dependent upon the provision of public water and sewer facilities to accommodate the planned densities for commercial, industrial, and residential uses. Providing the planned water and sewer infrastructure requires long range planning and capital investments to produce timely and cost effective systems.~~

During the Service District Plan Update from 1997 - 2003, the Board of Supervisors adopted phases for specific and designated areas planned for public water and sewer. For example, some plans specifically delineate "Sewered Areas" and "Non-Sewered Areas" where public sewer service is limited or not planned for the future.

This principle is demonstrated in the Warrenton Service District. The limited public sewer and water service extension capabilities of the Town to serve the unincorporated areas of the Warrenton Service District are controlled by agreements reached between the Town and County in the summer of 2001. The two jurisdictions defined certain limited areas where Town water and sewer would be provided, and established that such service should not be expected for the remainder of the Service District. Those limited areas are identified within The Town/County Master Water and Sewer Agreement, as amended. Properties that are not specified within this agreement for sewer service or served within a community sewer system owned, operated and maintained by the Fauquier County Water and Sanitation Authority (WSA), are located in the designated Non-Sewered Area of the Warrenton Service District. Furthermore, all future development needing public sewer and water in areas not designated for Town of Warrenton public utilities would also require a Plan Amendment authorizing service to be provided by the Fauquier County Water and Sanitation Authority.

Service Districts: Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3 Areas

~~For the 1992-2010 planning period the Service Districts have been planned to reflect future infrastructure planning. To assist with both the planning and the implementation program for the Service Districts, these areas have been planned for three phases of development, as set forth and defined below. The timeline established by these definitions directly reflects and incorporates the population forecast which is relied upon throughout this plan, as well as the anticipated availability of sewer and/or water capacity for the relevant time periods.~~

~~Phase 1: Those areas which are planned to be served by water and/or sewer in the 1992-2000 time-frame and in which water and/or sewer capacity presently exists, or is anticipated to be provided within~~

~~this Phase, to accommodate the population growth forecast~~.

~~Phase 2: Those areas which are planned for water and/or sewered growth in the 2000-2010 time-frame for water which water and/or sewer capacity is act being planned to meet the anticipated population growth.~~

~~Phase 3: Those selected areas, which were included as designated Service Districts in the adopted 1987 Comprehensive Plan, for which no active water and sewer planning is in the process at this time, and which are not necessary to meet the demands of the forecasted growth through 2010 but which uniquely lend themselves, from a land use and water/sewer planning perspective, to eventually be planned for growth~~.

~~In the Service District plans that follow, Warrenton Service District has areas in all three phases. Remington and Marshall contain only Phases 1 and 2. Bealeton contains only Phase 1. New Baltimore contains all three Phases, although significant public sewer capacity is not expected to be available until 2000. Midland, Catlett, Calverton, and Opal contain Phase 1 and Phase 3 areas, since this Plan does not project significant population growth in those Service Districts~~.

The County and the Water and Sanitation Authority (WSA) have undertaken studies to address the future provision of water and sewer to the Service Districts. It can be anticipated that amendments will be made to Service District plans as the County moves ahead in its planning. ~~It is a recommendation of this Plan that~~ The County will fully monitor population projections, and the Service District plans for the provision of water and sewer, and amend the Service District plans, including phasing, as appropriate. The County recognizes that in order to facilitate the cost-effective provision of water and sewer services it may be appropriate to redistribute densities within certain areas of the Service Districts. It must also be recognized that due to certain constraints, the cost-effective provision of water or sewer may not always be possible, and that could require the re-designation or planning of the affected service district~~s~~. ~~The County and WSA intend to work together to achieve, when appropriate and feasible, densities which will economically support the introduction of the water and sewer utility systems.~~

~~Development in Phase 2 and Phase 3 areas should be designed in such a manner as to be compatible with existing or planned utility systems so as not to hinder the efficient development of the service district or the County's ability to provide services in a cost-effective manner. It is a recommendation of this Plan that the County establish planning measures, such as zoning overlay districts, special exception approval requirements, and appropriate re-mapping within the service districts~~.

It is not intended, however, that the phasing provisions preclude the extension of public water and sewer

to correct existing or potential health problems for existing dwellings, commercial or industrial buildings. Similarly, this Plan does not intend to preclude the extension of public water and sewer to existing or planned governmental facilities that are near or adjacent to service districts. ~~The provision of public water and sewer to villages and settlements is addressed in Chapter 7.~~

Changes to Phasing Plans

Phasing areas are included in several district plans, and timelines are based on 2000 U.S. Census and related information and population projections made shortly thereafter. Over the period of this plan there will almost certainly be a need to make adjustments to the phasing boundaries and timelines based on population growth patterns, and the recommendations of the Master Water and Sewer Plan and other studies, such as transportation assessments. Changes in phasing areas and timelines, however, should not be automatic, but based on deliberate decisions by the Board of Supervisors following review and recommendations from the Planning Commission.

~~To change an area to Phase 1 from either Phase 2 or 3, a Comprehensive Plan amendment will be required. This Plan amendment may be initiated at any time by members of the public, the Planning Commission, or the Board of Supervisors~~. The Board of Supervisors may approve changes to the service district phasing following review and recommendation by the Planning Commission and findings by the Board of Supervisors provided that:

1. The patterns of population growth and development within the service district are nearing build-out capacity; and

2. The expanded area is clearly justified and appropriate for that specific community; and

3. Existing public water and sewer capacity to support the changes are available or scheduled ~~expected~~ to be provided prior to development in the new area; and

4. Other infrastructure, including roads, is sufficient to accommodate ~~Phase 1~~ development, is planned ~~expected~~ to be in place at the time of development, to be provided either by public or private funds or public private partnerships; and

5. The proposed amendment is consistent with the orderly development of the service districts.

In a low density area such as Fauquier County, residential rezoning and subdivision applications that meet Comprehensive Plan guidelines and Zoning and Subdivision regulations still present challenges to elementary, middle and high school capacities. The County has a comprehensive, 5-year capital improvements programming process, and education and school costs dominate that program. Hence,

applicants are expected to work with the Planning Commission, School Board and Board of Supervisors in developing an acceptable phasing program for any residential rezoning pending approval which meets school seat capacities or planned expansions. The County needs to determine if there are design and density incentives that can be included within the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances which would encourage developers of by-right subdivisions to phase their projects for durations more compatible with existing and planned public facilities and roadway expansions.

Residential Development within the Service Districts

The population projections and growth allocations in Chapter 3 show that approximately 75% of total residential growth will occur in service districts. This target is consistent with planning goal number 5 to concentrate and guide growth in ~~and around~~ service districts. ~~and villages.~~ Since 2000, approximately 60 percent of countywide growth has occurred within these districts. To this end, County plans and regulations ~~should encourage~~ will continue to guide growth ~~in~~ toward the service districts at proper zoning densities to ensure that services can be efficiently and economically provided.

Additions to the Service District

Any proposed addition to a service district shall require a Comprehensive Plan amendment. In considering such amendments, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors should examine such factors as: (a) the ~~need for additional area in the service district~~ justification for the proposed expansion of the community; (b) the availability of water and sewer and other infrastructure such as fire and rescue facilities, schools and roads; (c) the fiscal and communitywide impacts of the addition; and (d) the consistency of the ~~addition~~ proposed expansion with the orderly development of the service district.

Determining Service District Area and Land Use

Another objective of the service district planning concept is to provide sufficient quantities of un-developed land, either zoned or with the potential for residential development. ~~rezoning, to accommodate the population projections for the planning period. The~~ Population projections and service district allocations are discussed in Chapter 3 (Tables 3.17, 3.18, and 3.19). The service districts should also provide sufficient land for future commercial and industrial growth and for public facilities such as schools, roads, and parks.

~~In planning areas for residential growth, where the plan projects a population of 400 persons and if a household population of two persons per dwelling unit is established, 200 dwelling units would be required. If the desired density for an area is two dwelling units per acre (du/ac) then 100 acres of vacant land would be required to support the planned growth~~.

~~But Determining the size of the service districts is not, unfortunately, quite this~~ simple. A good future land use plan should include a mix of residential densities to provide for a variety of residential needs (e.g., single family detached, townhouses, and apartments) and for efficient delivery of services. Equally important and somewhat more complex is the need for community design which reduces dependency on the automobile as a result of considered school and employment locations, and provides modest room for service district growth and redevelopment. ~~A certain amount of over-planning is necessary to:~~

~~Accommodate the fact that all land areas will not provide a net lot or density that equates to the total area of the land. A 100 acre parcel planned for 2 dwelling units per acre will usually not yield 200 lots due to development constraints such as steep slopes, floodplains, public rights-of-way and infrastructure. Fauquier County has traditionally assumed that 25% of a site's acreage would not be buildable due to development physical, legal and other constraints and, therefore, has planned a minimum of 25% of the land area within each service district to support the projected population; and~~

~~Keep the market competitive by including more land area than needed to support projected growth. Land available for development should be less scarce and, therefore, land values should not be unduly inflated. Also, less expensive land costs might promote development of a more affordable housing stock.~~

~~There are no hard and fast rules on this "market factor" which are used to increase the amount of land planned for growth over that needed to handle projected growth; however, a factor of 1.5 seems to be a minimum and, in general, a market factor of 3 is used.~~

Since population is ~~the~~ a major key ~~unit for~~ determining planning areas, Fauquier County has used a methodology that first converts population projections to dwelling units, ~~applies the development constraint and market factor mentioned above,~~ and uses the resulting number ~~as~~ to determine the planned land area. ~~The 1987 Plan contains a more detailed description of this methodology.~~ In a number of service districts, total land planned for residential development exceeds that required to accommodate projected population. Where this over-planning exists it is generally the result of specific factors in the service district, such as the amount of existing development. It is possible to calculate from the area planned for development theoretical yields of dwelling units. ~~The charts for each service district show the additional dwelling unit potential for each phase. These additional dwelling unit potential and population numbers derived from it, however, illustrative only and should not be construed as population forecasts.~~ The population forecasts are stated in Chapter 3.

Land use mix and densities are also important elements of the service district plans. The service district plans include a range of residential densities that include low density (single family detached homes at a density of 1-3 dwelling units per acre), medium density (typically townhouses at a density of 4-6 dwelling

units per acre) and high density (garden apartments or low-rise apartments at a density range of 7-20 dwelling units per acre). There are also provisions for a Planned Residential Development (PRD) and Planned Development Mixed Use (PDMU) zoning districts within the Fauquier County Zoning Ordinance. ~~PRD's~~ Both are mixed use developments allowing a variety of residential units and densities and ~~some small scale~~ commercial uses (including offices) as part of the development ~~(the Waterfield PRD in New Baltimore, adjacent to Vint Hill, and parts of Reston, Virginia are examples).~~

Any PRD or PDMU zoning application proposal ~~will need to be accompanied with~~ may also need an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan justifying its fit within the designated community, demonstrating that it provides for its public facilities and infrastructure requirements, and meeting other established standards contained both within the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The Plan provides for Planned Industrial Districts which would allow a mix of offices, warehouses, and light industrial uses, and Planned Commercial/Industrial Districts which would allow a mix of retail uses, offices, and light industrial uses.

~~The Waterfield Planned Residential Development (PRD), approved in 1998, is identified on the New Baltimore Service District Plan. However, it may also be appropriate to treat PRDs (and Pills) as overlay districts that are not site specific. It is recommended that the County review and revise its Zoning Ordinance to establish PID and PCID designations.~~

The residential densities in this Plan utilize a similar density range as the 1994 plan as shown below. The one exception is the Planned Residential Development land use, which has been removed as a category. It is a genuine Zoning Ordinance district and is no longer used as a category to define land use within the Comprehensive Plan.

	1994 Plan	**2000 Plan**	**Expected Initial Density Calculation**
Low	1-3	1-3	1
Medium	4-6	4-6	4
High	7-20	7-10	7
Planned Residential	3-6	None	0

~~This change followed a review that indicated a need for increased densities for reasons that include~~ These density ranges are intended to:

1. Promote more efficient utilization of land;

2. Promote more affordable and diverse housing for all housing types;

3. Support more efficient and cost-effective use of public utilities;

4. Provide more flexibility for proffers, ~~and/or~~ impact fees and adequate public facilities programs (when authorized by State enabling legislation) for public facilities;

5. Provide sufficient density to enable the implementation of ~~a~~ limited Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) and Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) programs (when authorized by State enabling legislation); and

6. Provide development incentives that will be economical and at the same time foster development patterns that result in desirable communities with a sense of place and community.

The residential buildout estimates resulting from the Service District land use plans and incorporated towns are summarized in the table on the following page.

In-Fill Development

In service districts where substantial development has already occurred, the increased density afforded by this Plan to properties within those districts presents unique interface concerns. ~~with respect to in-filling of undeveloped properties at higher densities than presently exist on developed properties adjacent to the developing property~~. A key concern is what level of the density range is compatible with the adjoining and existing neighborhood.

In considering in-fill development within such service districts, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors should consider the following: 1) ~~the effect of the~~ in-fill development effects on adjacent properties; 2) methods in which the in-fill development may be buffered to alleviate interface problems with less dense parcels; 3) ~~its consistence~~ consistency with this Plan; and 4) whether such development is occurring in a consistent, orderly manner such that in-fill development at higher densities than ~~previously developed~~ already exist in the area occurs in a natural progression (i.e., from a more central area of higher density to lower densities at the district's perimeter boundary). ~~and does not leapfrog into developed areas in a manner detrimental to previously developed properties. Special consideration should be given where in-fill development occurs on parcels or assemblages of parcels, of such acreage that buffering to alleviate~~

~~adverse impacts of in-fill development on adjacent already developed parcels may not be feasible~~.

PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the service district land use plans will require a commitment to also implement the County's Capital Improvements Program (CIP). The CIP is designed to provide the required infrastructure for development in a timely and coordinated manner, and to provide appropriate land use control mechanisms to assure that development is coordinated with the infrastructure. Chapter 9 is specifically devoted to the infrastructure needs and should serve as a general guide for capital improvement programming.

Service District Build-Out Information

Service District	Towns	2000 Dwelling Totals	Dwelling Unit/Build-Out Totals
Bealeton		**1,027**	**3,200**
Calverton		**140**	**145**
Catlett		**156**	**312**
Marshall		**693**	**3,000**
Midland		**121**	**400**
New Baltimore		**2,435**	**5,000**
Opal		**128**	**200**
Remington*		**392**	**2,700**
Warrenton*		**1,526**	**2,300**
	Remington**	**255**	**300**
	The Plains**	**118**	**150**
	Warrenton**	**2,856**	***4,215
Total Dwelling Units		**9,847**	**21,922**

* Represents totals for the specified Service District, but excludes the incorporated portion of Remington and Warrenton. The latter is estimated separately.

** Incorporated Town 2000 data is based on the U.S. Census.

*** Based on the Town of Warrenton Comprehensive Plan.

~~The land use plans provide significant excess capacity in order to assure market forces will continue to be operative and sufficient land will be available for development. Land use control mechanisms need to be implemented to assure that development takes place in a timely fashion with respect to infrastructure needs~~.

The rezoning process should be utilized to ensure timely development, including phasing ~~of a~~ projects through time so their service demands placed on schools and other basic facility capacities are manageable. Rezonings should be required for densities in excess of the lower end of the land use density ranges except when performance incentives are involved.

The County should also consider adding performance incentives in the service districts to assist in better accomplishing the goals and objectives of the Plan. For example, ~~These incentives should be "by-right" incentives. development~~ density incentives could be granted for ~~meeting design standards, for~~ providing ~~assisting in the provision of~~ low and moderate income housing, or for ~~assisting in the preservation of agricultural and forestal areas by purchase of non-common open space~~ acquiring development rights for land that creates open space, parkland, and preservation areas in or near the affected service district community as designated within the Comprehensive Plan.

Residential rezoning applications are expected to be presented at the low end of each density range for the specified service district location. For example, in the plan designated residential locations where low density development is proposed (1-3 units per acre), any application above 1 dwelling unit per acre must justify those increases with the:

1. Provision of affordable housing (low/moderate income housing); and/or

2. Elimination of lot subdivision potential through easements (Purchase of Development Rights) on: (a) Rural Agricultural (RA) and Rural Conservation (RC) zoned properties generally located within the service district's magisterial district; (b) property designated as parkland or marked as a hard open space edge along the service district boundary within the service district plan; or (c) a critical future transportation corridor designated by the Board of Supervisors needing protection from further development; and/or

3. Implementation of unique town-scaled designs consistent with the adopted service district plan; and/or

4. Other combinations other than cash/material contributions to the needs of the County.

Future Measures

The land use plans shown for each service district are limited in the extent that specific details of individual communities are addressed. These land use plans are intended to be general when indicating areas where specific types of zoning are appropriate. No attempt has been made at this stage of the planning process to actually design the individual towns and communities. However, a master design plan is not a static document. ~~and should be developed for each service district that would~~ It builds upon and improves the community as it presently exists and is subject to periodic review and refinement.

Where a strong town character has been established, the community and the County can continue and improve upon those preferred attributes through expanded and enhanced future street, building and general architectural design. ~~In those cases where there is only a very loose town character or where no town really exists, a town center should be created. Well planned communities help~~ In Fauquier County, planning will seek to foster towns by providing opportunities for parks, schools and other public facilities, all carefully linked through a pedestrian friendly transportation network, and a variety of retail and employment services and opportunities. The planning process will discourage loose groupings of poorly linked streets with access limited through cul-de-sac dominated subdivisions which do not create real communities, create emergency service problems, and simply do not ~~nor do they~~ represent the best that the planning process can offer. County and community ~~design~~ plans ~~should~~ will be the result of coordinated efforts among existing residents, local officials, and a wide spectrum of professionals including architects, landscape architects, developers, and planners.

Transfer of Development Rights

Although not yet directly authorized by state enabling legislation, some non-contiguous open space can be obtained in the development process as an incentive to increase density within the planned density ranges using transferable development rights. The County, as an adjunct study, should set its priorities for desired open space both as to what types of lands (i.e., water supply sheds, prime agricultural areas, steep slopes, dominant terrain and exceptional viewsheds, areas of unique flora and fauna, and historic areas) where they are located, to where they may be transferred, and the density increase given per acre for each type.

All revised service district plans have open space, parkland, school sites and other associated town or village aspects which set the unique character of that community. One important and active principle is the development of a clear, hard edge of open space and parkland within at the perimeter of the districts. An example of that principle's implementation is represented in the Warrenton Service District with the 850 + acre St. Leonard's Farm. Here the approved rezoning application resulted in 41 lots being clustered, or approximately 80 percent of the overall property "by right density" in one location, while leaving 800 acres of the remaining property in a recorded conservation easement. The rezoning resulted

in no overall net increase in density. The planned clustered lots are effectively served through public water and sewer, while a valued open space gateway into the Town of Warrenton was preserved. Other districts have similar opportunities through easements and the Purchase of Development Rights Program.

Impact Fees

Impact fees are not yet authorized through state enabling legislation as a method for funding public facilities other than for roads. The County, however, should study the impacts of development; arrive at a methodology for measuring fiscal impacts, and use that methodology to evaluate infrastructure and facility needs in the rezoning process so that appropriate proffers may be negotiated. Developing such a methodology will also enable the County to implement impact fees expeditiously when enabling legislation is approved, and perhaps be of utility in convincing the General Assembly to develop more comprehensive impact fee legislation.

A modestly successful implementation technique is through the development of Proffer Policy, which covers, for example, the cost impacts per residential unit on basic public facilities (e.g., fire and rescue, libraries, parks and recreation, schools and the Sheriff). The Board of Supervisors adopted such a Proffer Policy on October 21, 2002. Pursuant to this document, the County staff: (a) calculates the annual net cost of public facilities; (b) calculates the fiscal impact of a rezoning request that permits residential uses; and (c) administers the collection and expenditure of proffered funds. ~~It needs to be noted that~~ Pursuant to the Code of Virginia, the Board of Supervisors may accept cash proffers for rezoning requests that permit residential uses in accordance with this policy, to mitigate public facility infrastructure impacts and requirements. ~~However,~~ The Board may also accept land, conservation easements or in kind improvements in accordance with County and state law.

OTHER PLANNING FACILITIES

Water and Sewer

The availability of public utilities (central water and sewer) is critical to the identification of an area as a service district. Although utilities are only one of a number of possible limitations to supporting higher density residential uses, they are the most ~~severe~~ acute constraint. Without water and sewer, service districts can exist only as villages with low density residential development and limited types of commercial and industrial development. The importance of water and sewer is reflected in the fact that utilities are the cornerstone of the service districts which are ~~in turn the foundation of the~~ essential to the Land Use Plan.

When planning for public water and sewer, the “Occoquan Policy” must be taken into consideration. The Occoquan Policy, adopted by the State Water Control Board in 1971, was enacted for the purpose of

protecting water quality in the Occoquan Reservoir, a major water supply for Northern Virginia. Over one third of Fauquier County's land area contributes to that watershed and thus falls under the requirements of the policy. Six of the nine County service districts and village service districts are either wholly or partially contained within the Occoquan watershed. New Baltimore, Catlett, and Calverton are entirely within the watershed; Midland, Opal, and the Warrenton service districts are partially within the Occoquan watershed.

The "Occoquan Policy" limits the number of sewage treatment facilities, which may discharge within the watershed. New plants must also treat effluent at the highest level that technology now permits. This tertiary treatment includes nitrogen, phosphorus, and chlorine removal before the effluent can be discharged to receiving waters. The cost of such facilities, including the required redundancy factors, can more than double the cost of treatment.

Transportation Planning

Transportation plans for each of the service districts propose new roads and indicate the improvements to existing roads necessitated by growth. Details of these plans are contained in Chapter 10. Alignments for the proposed new roads are shown as dashed lines on the various transportation plans, and are general in nature. These plans will provide the necessary framework for right-of- way acquisition, construction, and proffers in conjunction with the development process.

There are three major inter-service district arterials which must be carefully planned so that they will continue to function effectively as through- traffic movers. These are U.S 15/29, Route 17, and Route 28. U.S. 15/29 and Route 17, due to their linkages with I-66, I-81 and I-95, experience the mixing of significant local and regional automobile and truck traffic moving through the Washington Metropolitan Area. There are legs of U.S. 15/29 from the Prince William County line to the Opal Service District where daily traffic volumes in 2004 are exceeding 45,000. The pressures are becoming critical, with the limited availability of existing rights-of-way and funding constraints, to: (1) enforce limitations on the number of new development entrances; (2) close dangerous median crossings; and (3) implement more aggressive and coordinated efforts for expanded turn lanes, service roads, traffic signalization, and traffic calming designs.

In the Catlett, Calverton, and Midland service districts, a major constraint to further development is Route 28 itself. ~~Route 28's~~ This state primary road's capacity is already stressed by existing traffic loads. It is imperative that the future location and configuration of Route 28 be planned so that, along with the development of these Village Service Districts, it will continue to function effectively as an arterial highway and at the same time complement the planned communities by providing access. The Village Service District Plans for these communities have proposed safety improvements to key intersections

along Route 28. Those improvements are proposed to alleviate some of the existing volume issues over the next 10-15 years. Any improvements or changes to Route 28 also must consider the historic areas for these communities. The County has 21 villages and settlements that were identified in the **Survey Update of Historic Properties in Fauquier County (Dated March 20, 2002)** as eligible for Virginia Landmarks and National Register designation. Calverton, Catlett and Midland were included in that survey and are being scheduled for final survey work and nomination.

SERVICE DISTRICT PLANS

The following are plans for the six Service Districts (Bealeton, Marshall, New Baltimore, Opal, Remington and Warrenton) and three Village Service Districts (Calverton, Catlett and Midland). Presented in alphabetical order, each district plan provides its boundaries and key features, such as floodplain, parks, roads, schools, streams and railway lines. Planned uses and densities are identified by a legend shown on each Service District Plan, and/or are described within the subsequent text. ~~The basic plan show Phase 1 (1192-2000); where other phases (Phase 2 from 2000-2010, and Phase 3, past 2010) exist they are marked as such.~~

~~The 1992-2010 Plan uses property lines or other distinguishable features to delineate plan and use boundaries, as opposed to the 1987 Plan which used a more general format that often led to difficulties with interpretation of the actual boundaries~~.